

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

**APPELLANTS' REPLY BRIEF**

APPELLANTS: Bocionek et al. CONFIRMATION NO.: 9465  
SERIAL NO.: 09/994,184 GROUP ART UNIT: 2177  
FILED: November 26, 2001 EXAMINER: Sara m. Hanne  
TITLE: MEDICAL SYSTEM ARCHITECTURE WITH AN INTEGRATED  
RIS CLIENT ON THE CONSOLE COMPUTER OF A  
MODALITY

**MAIL STOP APPEAL BRIEF- PATENTS**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

S I R:

In accordance with the provisions of 37 C.F.R. §41.41, Appellants herewith reply to the Examiner's Answer mailed June 9, 2009.

In general, Appellants believe the points raised by the Examiner in the Answer have all been addressed in Appellants' Main Brief. The only issue raised in the Examiner's Answer that may benefit from additional comments on the part of the Appellants is the position of the Examiner that the language in the claims, particularly claim 1, regarding processing that takes place at the workstation, is only a statement of intended use, which the Examiner believes is satisfied by the Buytaert reference, by virtue of a user at the workstation disclosed in the Buytaert reference performing such processing steps mentally.

In response, Appellants submit that the explicit language of independent claim 1 describes the generation of an RIS client window and RIS interaction masks, and

states that the general purpose processing and analysis of the images at the processor is undertaken using this RIS client window and the RIS interaction masks. Appellants submit that such tools (client window and interaction masks) make sense only when implemented by or through or on a computer. Appellants submit that, although the Examiner is correct that certain tasks can be performed in the mind of the user who is employing the system disclosed in the Buytaert reference, those tasks do not and cannot involve the “mental equivalent” of a client window or interaction masks. This is one reason why Appellants stated in their Main Brief that the Buytaert reference provides no details as to how any computer-supported analysis or processing takes place. As noted in Appellants’ Main Brief, the only disclosure in the Buytaert reference that might relate to such processing is the display of the RIS client windows for the purpose of adding demographic patient information to the acquired images. There is no teaching or suggestion in the Buytaert reference to conduct any type of processing or analysis of the image itself, and more importantly there is no teaching to undertake such analysis or evaluation via single work station (processor) making use of an RIS mediator and an RIS server, with the processor being programmed as an RIS client, as set forth in independent claim 1.

Appellants therefore respectfully submit that independent claim 1 is patentable over the teachings of the references relied upon by the Examiner, as are all of the claims depending therefrom.

An oral hearing is not being requested in connection with this appeal, and therefore the appeal is a form ready for transmittal to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required, or to credit any overpayment to account No. 501519.

Submitted by



(Reg. 28,982)

Schiff, Hardin LLP

**CUSTOMER NO. 26574**

Patent Department

Suite 6600

233 South Wacker Drive

Chicago, Illinois 60606

Telephone: 312/258-5790

Attorneys for Appellants

CH2\7489353.1